III. REMARKS

Claims 10-12, 14-17, 19, 23, 24, 32, 33, 36 and 37 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 13, 18, 35 and 39 are cancelled; and, claims 10, 15, 32 and 36 have been amended herein. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Applicants further point out the claims have been amended herein only by incorporating the claim language of claim 13 into claim 10; incorporating the claim language of claim 18 into claim 15; incorporating the claim language of claim 35 into claim 32; and, incorporating the claim language of claim 39 into claim 36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

Claims 35 and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter. In response, Applicants have incorporated the claim language from dependent claims 35 and 39 into independent

claims 32 and 36, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants contend that independent claims

32 and 36 are in condition for allowance. With respect to dependent claims 33 and 37

Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the

independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to

be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

Claims 10-19 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Verbeke (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0098447), hereinafter "Verbeke". Claims

32-33 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verbeke

in view of Ekkel (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0088571), hereinafter "Ekkel".

This rejection is defective because Verbeke does not disclose each and every

feature set forth in the claims as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claim 10 recites:

> "A system for sharing source code over a network, comprising:
> a code pattern classifier for analyzing source code generated on a sharing node in the network to identify a set of code patterns, and for assigning at least one predetermined category to the source code based on the identified set of code patterns, wherein code pattern information that is based on the analysis and assignment is stored in a directory; and
> a source code indexer for selectively indexing the source code, a dependent code type, and an associated code type, wherein the source code indexer comprises:
> a programming language recognizer for recognizing at least one programming language of the source code;
> a selective code content indexer for indexing relevant portions of the source code based on the at least one programming language;
> a dependency graph indexer for recognizing and indexing a graph of source code dependencies corresponding to the source code;
> a code type hierarchy recognizer for recognizing a code type hierarchy associated with the source code; and

an associated code type indexer for indexing a set of code types from the code type hierarchy that is associated with the source code."

Verbeke fails to disclose, among other features, "a source code indexer for selectively indexing the source code [ ] wherein the source code indexer comprises [ ] a selective code content indexer for indexing relevant portions of the source code based on the at least one programming language." (emphasis added) See independent claim 10 and similarly in independent claims 15, 23 and 24.

In support of the rejection of the selective code content indexer (for example as in claim 23) the Office cites column 14:0198-0199, starting with the statement "…This content may include data…" Office Action, item 5, page 5. There is no specific disclosure in Verbeke regarding the specific type of selective code content, as claimed, nor is one offered by the Examiner. The cited paragraphs (i.e., 0198 and 0199) merely disclose, in general, a peer-to-peer platform that enables peers to find content that is closest to them. There is nothing specifically disclosed in the cited section, nor in Verbeke on whole, that teaches a selective code content indexer that indexes source code as in the claimed invention. Verbeke does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 10, and claims 11, 12 and 14 that are dependent on independent claim 10, are allowable. Further, Applicants submit that independent claim 15, and claims 16, 17, 19 that are dependent on

Appl. No. 10/608,204
Reply to Final Office Action of 11/20/2007

Page 14 of 15

independent claims 15, and independent claims 23 and 24 are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth with regard to independent claim 10.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 18, 2008   /Joseph J. Christian/

Joseph J. Christian
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044